

REMARKS

Claims 1-50 are currently pending in the application. No claims have been added, amended, or canceled. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks.

Claims 12-15 and 28-31 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but have been indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter.

Claims 1-11, 16-27, and 32-50 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,026,293 to Osborn ("Osborn"). Independent claim 1 is directed to a method for providing controlled access to a desired function in a system. Applicant respectfully submits that Osborn fails to teach or suggest at least one of the distinguishing features of independent claim 1, namely, a system including a plurality of functions, each of the plurality of functions having a corresponding key associated therewith.

Osborn is directed to a protection mechanism that provides access control to capabilities of reprogramming software in a device. A public key cryptography scheme is used to avoid the need for storage of secret keys or passwords. A data transfer device may be interfaced with the device for memory access of the device. Prior to the memory access, a process to authenticate the data transfer device is initiated.

In contrast to claim 1, there is no teaching or suggestion by Osborn of a system including a plurality of functions, each of the plurality of functions having a corresponding key associated therewith. In Osborn, an IROM shown in figure 4 includes a boot code, a hash code, a public key, and an authentication code. The boot code, the hash code, the public key, and the authentication code are utilized for an authentication process. The authentication process as disclosed in Osborn requires that an external entity be in possession of a corresponding secret key of a public/private encryption scheme that is used to implement the authentication process. However, Osborn is not capable of providing access to a plurality of functions as claimed. In addition, Osborn does not teach or suggest wherein each of the plurality of functions has a corresponding key associated therewith as claimed. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that

claim 37 distinguishes over Osborn for similar reasons to those outlined above with respect to independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 37 distinguish over Osborn and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1 and 37 as anticipated by Osborn is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 1-11 and 16-20 depend from and further restrict independent claim 1 in a patentable sense. Dependent claims 38-44 depend from and further restrict independent claim 37 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claims 1 and 37, respectively, dependent claims 1-11, 16-20, and 38-44 distinguish over Osborn and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 1-11, 16-20, and 38-44 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 21 is directed to a method for providing controlled access to a desired function in a system that includes one or more functions. Applicant respectfully submits that Osborn fails to teach or suggest at least one of the distinguishing features of independent claim 1, namely, conducting a first authentication process includes using a first key corresponding to a desired function and conducting a second authentication process using a second key generated based on a random challenge made during the first authentication process.


In contrast to claim 21, Osborn teaches a single authentication process and fails to teach a first authentication process and a second authentication process as claimed. Osborn discloses a secure microprocessor adapted to send a programming request message to a controller along with a random number (Rand1) generated by the secure microprocessor. The secure microprocessor then generates a challenge response based on Rand1, Rand2, and a private key. The challenge response is returned to the controller which processes the challenge using Rand1, Rand2, and a public key. The controller as disclosed in Osborn generates only one response signal which indicates that only one authentication process takes place and not a first authentication process and a second authentication process as claimed. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 45 distinguishes over Osborn for similar reasons to those stated above with respect to independent claim 21. Applicant respectfully submit that independent claims 21 and 45 distinguish over Osborn and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 21 and 45 as anticipated by Osborn is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 22-27 and 32-36 depend from and further restrict independent claim 21 in a patentable sense. Dependent claims 46-50 depend from and further restrict independent claim 45 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claims 21 and 45, respectively, dependent claims 22-27, 32-36, and 46-50 distinguish over Osborn and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 22-27, 32-36, and 46-50 is respectfully requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently-pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: June 16, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Ross T. Robinson

Registration No.: 47,031

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL
CORPORATION

1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200

Dallas, Texas 75202

(214) 855-4500

Attorneys For Applicant